SOUTHE	STATES DISTRICT COURT ERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
In Re: Me Products I	x ethyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (õMTBEö) Liability Litigation	Master File No. 1:00-1898 MDL 1358 (SAS) M21-88
	iment relates to the following case:	ECF Case
	ew York v. Amerada Hess Corp., et al. 04 Civ. 3417	
	x	
PLAIN	TIFF CITY OF NEW YORK'S PROPOSED	JURY VERDICT FORMS
W follows:	e the jury in the above-captioned action answer the	e questions submitted to us as
STRICT	LIABILITY DESIGN DEFECT	
1.	Was the gasoline manufactured by defendant E defectively designed so that it was not reasonable	
	Yes	No
2.	Was this design defect a substantial factor in ca	nusing the Cityøs injury?
	Yes	No
STRICT	LIABILITY FAILURE TO WARN	
3.	Did defendant ExxonMobil fail to give a warni not reasonably safe to store in underground store	-
	Yes	No
4.	Was this failure to warn a substantial factor in o	

TRESPASS

	5.	enter the City's property and contaminate its groundwater?		
			Yes	No
	6.	Did ExxonMobiløs actions or fail enter the Cityøs property?	lure to act cause or assi	ist in causing the MTBE to
			Yes	No
VIOL	ATI	ON OF TSCA		
	7.	Did ExxonMobil ever fail to submit reports, notices, or other information to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (õEPAö) regarding the adverse environmental or health-related impacts of MTBE?		
			Yes	No
8. If your answer to question 7 is yes, at the time ExxonMobil notices, or other information to the United States Environm (õEPAö) regarding the adverse environmental or health-rela ExxonMobil have actual knowledge that the EPA already k environmental and health related impacts?		onmental Protection Agency -related impacts of MTBE, did		
			Yes	No
PRIVA	АТЕ	E NUISANCE		
	9.	Did ExxonMobiløs conduct in co with the Cityøs use of its water?	nnection with gasoline	containing MTBE interfere
		with the City was of its water:	Yes	No

	10. Was ExxonMobiløs interference	substantial? Yes	No	
	11. Was ExxonMobiløs interference	unreasonable? Yes	No	
	12. Did ExxonMobil know its interf conduct?	erence was substantia	lly certain to result from its	
	conduct.	Yes	No	
NEGLI	IGENCE			
	13. Did ExxonMobil fail to use reasonable care in manufacturing, promoting, distributing or selling gasoline containing MTBE or by failing to ensure that station owners and others properly stored or dispensed MTBE?			
		Yes	No	
	14. Was ExxonMobil failure to use reasonable care a substantial factor in the Cityøs injury?			
		Yes	No	
	15. Did Exxon fail to use reasonable selling gasoline containing MTE distributors and others about how MTBE?	BE in that it failed to v	varn gas station owners,	
		Yes	No	
	16. Was ExxonMobil failure to use entering the City's groundwater		stantial factor in MTBEøs	
	5 Jyn 8 - 1 minutes	Yes	No	
	45 W 5 W 1			
	17. Has ExxonMobil committed gro	oss negligence or willf Yes		

VIOLATION OF NY NAVIGATION LAW

			d by an oil spill caused by the k Navigation Law § 181?
		Yes	No
PUBI	LIC NUISANCE		
	gasoline containing MTE exercise of rights commo	BE offend, interfere with on to all in a manner suc	omoting, distributing or selling or cause damage to the public in the has to offend public morals or of a considerable number of persons
		Yes	No
	20. Did ExxonMobiløs condu	act violate a statute or la	w?
		Yes	No
DAM A	AGES		
	21. What sum of money will damages it suffered and t		ompensate the City for any and all onMobil?
		Damages:	
MINI	TIVE DAMAGES		

22. Do you find that ExxonMobiløs actions were wanton and reckless or malicious such that the City is entitled to an award of punitive damages?

Case 1:00-cv-01898-VSB-VF Document 2583 Filed 06/26/09 Page 5 of 5

		Yes	No
	23. If yes how much?	Amount:	?
Dated		Jury Forepers	on